

RANDALL S. LUSKEY (SBN: 240915)  
rluskey@paulweiss.com  
**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON  
& GARRISON LLP**  
535 Mission Street, 24th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (628) 432-5100  
Facsimile: (628) 232-3101

ROBERT ATKINS (*Pro Hac Vice* admitted)  
ratkins@paulweiss.com  
CAITLIN E. GRUSAUSKAS (*Pro Hac Vice* admitted)  
cgrusauskas@paulweiss.com  
ANDREA M. KELLER (*Pro Hac Vice* admitted)  
akeller@paulweiss.com

**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON  
& GARRISON LLP**  
1285 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (212) 373-3000  
Facsimile: (212) 757-3990

*Attorneys for Defendants*  
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
RASIER, LLC, and RASIER-CA, LLC

*[Additional Counsel Listed on Following Page]*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES,  
INC., PASSENGER SEXUAL  
ASSAULT LITIGATION

Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB

**DECLARATION OF JAMIE BROWN**

This Document Relates to:  
  
ALL ACTIONS

Judge: Hon. Lisa J. Cisneros  
Courtroom: G – 15th Floor

1 MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY (SBN: 277035)

2 mshortnacy@shb.com

3 **SHOOK, HARDY & BACON, L.L.P.**

4 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3000

5 Los Angeles, CA 90067

6 Telephone: (424) 285-8330

7 Facsimile: (424) 204-9093

8 PATRICK OOT (*Pro Hac Vice* admitted)

9 oot@shb.com

10 **SHOOK, HARDY & BACON, L.L.P.**

11 1800 K Street NW, Suite 1000

12 Washington, DC 20006

13 Telephone: (202) 783-8400

14 Facsimile: (202) 783-4211

15 KYLE N. SMITH (*Pro Hac Vice* admitted)

16 ksmith@paulweiss.com

17 JESSICA E. PHILLIPS (*Pro Hac Vice* admitted)

18 jphillips@paulweiss.com

19 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON**  
20 **& GARRISON LLP**

21 2001 K Street, NW

22 Washington DC, 20006

23 Telephone: (202) 223-7300

24 Facsimile: (202) 223-7420

25 *Attorneys for Defendants*

26 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

27 RASIER, LLC, and RASIER-CA, LLC

1 I, Jamie Brown, declare under penalty of perjury as follows:

2 1. I am a Vice President of Global Advisory Services at Lighthouse, which provides  
3 eDiscovery services to Uber Technologies Inc. (“Uber”), a Defendant in the above captioned matter.  
4 I previously set forth my qualifications in a declaration provided in support of Uber’s ESI protocol  
5 on April 12, 2024, which are incorporated herein.

6 2. I submit this declaration at Defendant Uber’s request and in support of its proposed  
7 plan regarding the production of an updated set of documents with a timeframe from November 28,  
8 2023 through December 1, 2024 (the “post-November 2023 data set”) documents. The purpose of  
9 my declaration is to set forth an estimated timeframe to collect, process, review and produce the  
10 post-November 2023 data set. I am familiar with the facts contained herein and am prepared to  
11 testify to the extent required.

12 **Assumptions**

13 3. The post-November 2023 data set includes data from 28 custodians from various data  
14 sources used by Uber employees.

15 4. The estimated time to *collect* this data differs for each source based on various  
16 factors, including data volume and export capabilities of the underlying system. Similarly, the  
17 estimated time to *process* the data will also vary by data source due to volume and Lighthouse’s  
18 workflow for that data type; some data is easier and, therefore, faster for Lighthouse’s systems to  
19 process while other data is more nuanced and requires more time. The time it takes to perform these  
20 tasks is largely driven by the machine as opposed to human hours. Machine time is limited by the  
21 nature of the task; adding additional computing resources to those currently improved will not  
22 materially improve machine time requirements and may introduce errors.

23 5. The estimated *review* times are based upon several components, including time to  
24 train the technology assisted review (TAR) model,<sup>1</sup> time to conduct the human review (for  
25 responsiveness and privilege), and machine time. The review estimates are based on data volumes  
26 and/or the document numbers, as opposed to the specific system, at least for this purpose.

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> Each time new data is introduced, the TAR model must be retrained to account for novel concepts within the data set.

1           6.       Uber has completed the collection of custodial data for the 28 custodians, except for  
2 data from Slack and Google Drive, which Uber anticipates completing by December 31, 2024 and  
3 January 3, 2025 respectively.<sup>2</sup> Once complete, this data will be transferred to Lighthouse for  
4 processing, hosting and review.

5           7.       Based on the work Lighthouse has performed to date, we estimate there will be  
6 approximately two million unique documents after de-duplication (which equates to approximately  
7 72,000 documents per custodian), which must be promoted to the TAR system, a step that also  
8 requires machine time. Using the search term hit estimate of 32%, we then estimate that  
9 approximately 600,000 documents will be subject to the TAR process.

10          8.       Assuming 12-17% of the TAR review population will be sent to the review team for  
11 human review (72,000 – 102,000 documents), we estimate it will take 3-5 days to complete (based  
12 on an average review rate of 30 docs/hour at 8 hrs/day for 100 reviewers). Once reviewed, the  
13 documents will need to be QC'ed and reviewed for privilege, which we estimate will take an  
14 additional 3-5 days (based on an average review rate of 20 docs/hour at 8 hrs/day for 20 reviewers);  
15 it's important to note that the privilege review for the post-November 2023 data set is expected to  
16 take longer than previous data sets, because the documents were generated during the pendency of  
17 the litigation.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 <sup>2</sup> Lighthouse obtained these estimates from Uber's eDiscovery team and they are consistent with the timeframe  
27 Lighthouse has observed in other Uber matters. I understand Plaintiffs have questioned the time it takes to collect this  
28 data. Having worked with hundreds of clients to collect data from the same systems, the estimates provided are also  
consistent with industry norms. The time involved to collect and export broad sets of data – data that is only limited by  
timeframe and custodian – often takes weeks on end. This is normal with modern enterprise tools for communication  
and collaboration (e.g., M365, Workspace, Slack, etc), which are commonplace today.

9. These estimates are summarized in the chart below:

DATE	STAGE	DESCRIPTION
<b>CUSTODIAL DATA (EXCEPT SLACK AND DRIVE)</b>		
12/19/24	Collection	Uber completed collection of post-November 2023 data
12/26/24	Processing	LH to complete processing of post-November 2023 data
1/3/24	Processing	LH to complete search-term application and TAR promotion
2/4/24	Review	LH to complete TAR model training; data to be promoted to review team
2/12/24	Review	Review team completes review for responsiveness and initial privilege
2/19/24	Review	Review team completes second-level review for privilege
2/26/24	Review	LH completes QC and production
<b>SLACK AND DRIVE DATA</b>		
1/3/25	Collection	Uber to complete collection of post-November 2023 data
1/24/25	Processing	LH to complete processing of post-November 2023 data
1/31/25	Processing	LH to complete search term application and TAR promotion
2/21/25	Review	LH to complete TAR model training; data to be promoted to review team
2/28/25	Review	Review team completes review for responsiveness and initial privilege
3/7/25	Review	Review team completes second-level review for privilege
3/14/25	Review	LH completes QC and production

10. I understand the parties have discussed prioritizing 10 custodians as a means to expedite production. If Lighthouse did that, this would result in a 5-day reduction to the aforementioned timeline for the priority custodial data set **(for a modified production date of February 21)**, given that the most time-intensive portion of the process is the TAR model training. For the Slack and Drive data, however, this would result in a 10-day reduction to the aforementioned timeline **(for a modified production date of March 4)** total given the processing time is more extensive for these two sources; however, there are some losses with the TAR training model given

1 the nature of this data. The two trade-offs that arise when you break up the custodian pool are  
2 process efficiency and the TAR model, which benefits from a broader data set.

3 11. I affirm under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of New York that the  
4 foregoing statement is true and correct. Executed on December 20, 2024 in New York, New York.  
5

6 /s/ *Jamie Brown*  
7 Jamie Brown  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28